

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

09/307,452

Applicant(s)

LAVIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Art Unit

Jenise E. Jackson

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 1/10/2005.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 6,7,12 and 18.
3. ☒ The drawings filed on 07 May 1999 are accepted by the Examiner.
4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).


* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

5. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
6. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
- (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
- 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
7. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _____
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____
7. ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other _____


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Reasons For Allowance

1. Status of Claims: In the previous office action, dated 3/12/04, claims 6-7, 12, were allowed, and claim 18 was rejected. The Applicant has amended claim 18, to contain features of claims 6-7, and 12. Thus, claims 6-7, 12, and 18 are allowable for the reasons listed below:

2. In the prior art of security, fails to disclose or suggest, “a policy server receiving the request for allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature”, “the policy server comparing the authenticated signature with information stored on the policy server”, and “policy server sending a response to the SAM indicating an access level corresponding to the authenticated signature”. An example of prior art in security, that fails to disclose or suggest, “a policy server receiving the request for allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature”, “the policy server comparing the authenticated signature with information stored on the policy server”, and “policy server sending a response to the SAM indicating an access level corresponding to the authenticated signature”, is Touboul. Touboul discloses protecting a client from hostile downloadables. Touboul discloses that the system includes security rules defining suspicious actions such as write operations. Touboul discloses that when an applet violates a security rule it is added to suspicious downloadables database. Prior art of security fails to teach, and more specifically Touboul fails to teach or suggest, “a policy server receiving the request for allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature”, “the policy server comparing the authenticated signature with information stored on the policy server”, and “policy server sending a response to the SAM indicating an access level corresponding to the authenticated signature”. There is no authentication of applets in Touboul. The security rules that are disclosed in Touboul deal with write operations, overuse of system memory, overuse of processor time.

Art Unit: 2131

3. In the prior art of networking, prior art fails to disclose or suggest, “a policy server receiving the request for allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature”, “the policy server comparing the authenticated signature with information stored on the policy server”, and policy server sending a response to the SAM indicating an access level corresponding to the authenticated signature”, an example of prior art in networking that does not disclose the limitations above, is Riggins. Riggins discloses a web engine includes a servlet host engine, which downloads security applets including an authentication applet to the client computer and accordingly executes an authentication servlet of servlets for performing identification and authentication services.

4. In the art of security levels, that fails to disclose or suggest, “a policy server receiving the request for allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature”, “the policy server comparing the authenticated signature with information stored on the policy server”, and policy server sending a response to the SAM indicating an access level corresponding to the authenticated signature”, is Golan. Golan discloses that every monitored application executes in a secure sandbox. The secure sandbox enables downloaded activex controls to run within limitations configurable by a security policy. Golan does not disclose or suggest, “a policy server receiving the request for allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature”, “the policy server comparing the authenticated signature with information stored on the policy server”, and policy server sending a response to the SAM indicating an access level corresponding to the authenticated signature”.

5. In the art of non-patent literature, fails to teach or suggest, “a policy server receiving the request for allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature”, “the policy server

comparing the authenticated signature with information stored on the policy server”, and policy server sending a response to the SAM indicating an access level corresponding to the authenticated signature”, an example is Yerxa. Yerxa teaches that the Java virtual machine lets applets or applications execute within the sandbox. Yerxa does not teach or suggest, “a policy server receiving the request for allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature”, “the policy server comparing the authenticated signature with information stored on the policy server”, and policy server sending a response to the SAM indicating an access level corresponding to the authenticated signature”.

6. Another example of non-patent literature, that fails to teach or suggest, “a policy server receiving the request for allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature”, “the policy server comparing the authenticated signature with information stored on the policy server”, and policy server sending a response to the SAM indicating an access level corresponding to the authenticated signature”, is Karve. Karve teaches Javasoft introduced the ability to sign applets. Karve teaches that a digital signature can be included within an applet. The CA of Karve verifies the identity of the holder. However, Karve fails to teach or suggest, “a policy server receiving the request for allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature”, “the policy server comparing the authenticated signature with information stored on the policy server”, and policy server sending a response to the SAM indicating an access level corresponding to the authenticated signature”.

Art Unit: 2131

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenise E. Jackson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3791. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



April 28, 2005


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100